

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed August 10, 2006 (the "Office Action"). Independent Claims 1, 8, 13, 20, 25, 26, and 27 have been amended and Claims 5, 7, 17, and 19 have been canceled. Therefore, Claims 1-2, 4, 6, 8-14, 16, 18, and 20-27 remain in the application of which Claims 1, 13, 25, 26, and 27 are the only independent Claims. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action of all pending Claims in view of the following remarks.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 2, 4-14, and 16-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,057,915 to Squire et al. ("*Squire*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,793,958 to Holt et al. ("*Holt*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reasons discussed below.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite "receiving reflected energy from said beam onto a detector having a two-dimensional array of detector elements and, in response, forming a two-dimensional image representing a contiguous 360° azimuthal view on the detector." *Holt* does not disclose, teach, or suggest receiving reflected energy from said beam onto a detector having a two-dimensional array of detector elements and, in response, forming a two-dimensional image representing a contiguous 360° azimuthal view on the detector. The receiving portion of *Holt* teaches a complex mirror assembly comprising a number of reflecting wedges 18r, a reflecting cone 16r, and a concentrator 14r that indiscriminately columnates light energy from 360 degrees azimuthal extent (See *Holt*, column 3, line 42 to column 4, line 7). This indiscriminate column of light energy is ideally unsuited for forming a two-dimensional image representing a contiguous 360° azimuthal view. In particular, the reflecting wedges and concentrator of *Holt* scatters received energy such that a contiguous two-dimensional image is not possible.

Squire also does not disclose, teach, or suggest receiving reflected energy from said beam onto a two-dimensional array of detector elements and, in response, forming a two-dimensional image representing a contiguous 360° azimuthal view on the detector. *Squire* only teaches use of a two-dimensional array of detector elements having a relatively narrow azimuthal view angle. To circumvent this problem, *Squire* uses a scanning mirror in order to provide a relatively wide azimuthal view (See *Squire*, column 3, lines 18-32). Thus, *Squire*

does not disclose, teach, or suggest forming a two-dimensional image representing a contiguous 360° azimuthal view on the detector.

Therefore, neither *Squire*, *Holt*, or any combination thereof disclose, teach, or suggest a two dimensional array of detector elements and, in response, forming a two-dimensional image representing a contiguous 360° azimuthal view on the detector as claimed in Applicant's Claim 1. Accordingly, Claim 1 is patentable over *Squire* in view of *Holt*. Independent Claims 13, 25, 26, and 27 are patentable for analogous reasons, as are all claims depending therefrom. Reconsideration and favorable action are requested.

CONCLUSION


Applicant has now made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for immediate allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other apparent reasons, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of all pending Claims.

If the Examiner feels that prosecution of the present Application may be advanced in any way by a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at 214-953-6447.

Applicant does not believe that any fees are due. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any required fees and credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicants



Bradley P. Williams
Reg. No. 40,227

Date: September 12, 2006

Customer Number: **45,507**